

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 22, 2011. Claims 19, 23, 26, 28, 30, 31 and 33 are pending in the application, with Claims 34 to 36 having been cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 19, 26, 28 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 19 was objected to for informalities, which is believed to be obviated by the amendments set forth above. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 23, 26, 28 and 30 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,941 (Nguyen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,565 (Scheidig) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,120,646 (Streepy, Jr.). Claims 34 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nguyen, Scheidig, Streepy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,728 (Vidyanand).

In response, the substance of Claim 34 has been incorporated into the independent claims herein, and Claims 34 to 36 have consequently been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection, as explained in greater detail below.

The present claims generally concern a data processing apparatus, which communicates with a printer capable of interpreting a plurality of printing languages, that processes image data by using a resource retained in memory, the resource being used for the plurality of printing languages.

Among other notable features, the present claims include the features of obtaining the resources from the printer, and referring to name-use information set to the

obtained resources to display a list of the obtained resources by using the display name corresponding to a printing language to be used. When the plurality of obtained resources includes a resource which is used by the printing language to be used for which a choice is made that any display name is not displayed, a list not including the resource is displayed.

By virtue of the foregoing claimed arrangement, any information regarding a resource obtained from a printer is not displayed in a list by the data processing apparatus if a printing language that may use the obtained resource is set as not being displayed.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the subject matter of the present claims, or the attendant benefits provided thereby. In particular, none of Nguyen, Scheidig, Streepy, Jr. and Vidyanand is seen to disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of obtaining the resources from the printer, referring to name-use information set to the obtained resources to display a list of the obtained resources by using the display name corresponding to a printing language to be used, and when the plurality of obtained resources includes a resource which is used by the printing language to be used for which a choice is made that any display name is not displayed, a list not including the resource is displayed.

In its rejection of Claim 34 at page 9, the Office Action appears to concede that Nguyen, Scheidig and Streepy, Jr. fail to disclose “obtaining the resource from the image processing apparatus”. Reliance was placed on Vidyanand, column 8, lines 12 to 18, for such a disclosure, but Applicant respectfully submits that such reliance is misplaced.

The above-cited portion of Vidyanand is seen to disclose that a settings submenu includes controls for exporting a selected set of printer preferences, importing a selected set of printer preferences, storing a selected set of printer preferences, retrieving a

selected set of printer preferences, or saving a selected set of printer preferences as a new set. However, Applicant submits that in Vidyanand, the “printer preference” is setting data to be used by a printer driver of a host computer, but is never used by a printer. See, e.g., column 1, lines 13 to 15 of Vidyanand.

Thus, as understood by Applicant, Vidyanand discloses movement, such as an export, of the “printer preference” from a printer driver of a host computer to a printer driver of another computer. In contrast, in the present claims, resources are obtained by a data processing apparatus from a printer.

In other words, even if the position were taken that the “printer preferences” of Vidyanand correspond to the claimed resources, which Applicant does not concede is correct, Vidyanand still fails to disclose or suggest obtaining resources from a printer because the “printer preferences” are moved from a computer to another computer, rather than from a printer to a data processing apparatus.

In addition, at page 9, the Office Action takes the position that Streepy, Jr., column 23, lines 26 to 36, discloses the feature of “when the plurality of resources obtained by said obtaining means includes a resource for which a choice is selected by said selection means that any display name is not displayed, the display means displays a list not including the resource”. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The above-cited portion of Streepy, Jr. is seen to disclose that terms give names to concepts. When creating a concept, the user must assign it at least one term so that the concept can have a display term. After a concept has been created, the user can add new terms to it, retire outdated terms, change a term’s type and reassign the display term. As with retired concepts, retired terms can also be shown or hidden.

However, the above portion of Streepy, Jr. is not understood by Applicant to disclose or suggest that when the plurality of obtained resources includes a resource which is used by the printing language to be used for which a choice is made that any display name is not displayed, a list not including the resource is displayed, as recited in the present claims.

The remaining applied references have been reviewed but are not seen to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Vidyanand and Streepy, Jr.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present claims recite subject matter that would not have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, and allowance is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher M. Barkley/
Christopher M. Barkley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 64,329

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200